

-12-

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on March, 20, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-11, 19-29 and 37-42 are now pending in this Application. Independent claims 1, 19, 37 and 38 have been amended and a version of the claims is included herein. Applicants believe that the claims are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesy extended to Applicants' representatives on May 24, 2007 wherein the claims and prior art of record were discussed. The amendments to the claims are in response to the discussion.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1 and 19 stand rejected under **35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1** as for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner states that there could not be found any discussion in the specification of how the system would be used **to detect a change in root level domains**. Applicants disagree.

As amended independent claim 1 and 19 recite **detecting an occurrence of a secondary content condition in the redirection information, the secondary content condition indicating a requirement for presentation of secondary content to the requesting device...such that the requesting device accesses the secondary content after occurrence of the secondary content condition, wherein the secondary content condition comprises a detection of a change in root level domains...**

Such limitations are discussed at length in Applicants' Specification at page 14. In particular, Applicants' Specification explains that one method for re-directing the client computer is to send an HTTP redirection code along with the URL (Universal Resource Locator) of the secondary content. The redirection code causes the client computer system to execute a first redirection command for content to the secondary content source. According to one embodiment of the invention, the redirection

-13-

information message also includes the address of the originally-requested address and content filename. In particular, the universal resource locator (URL) address provided as part of the redirection information is made up of the address for the secondary content source and content name, followed by a question mark which is used as a delimiter, then followed by the address and content name of the originally-requested content appended afterward, for example, <http://www.scs.com/ad-page?www.ics.com/home-page>. By executing the first redirection command using this address, the client computer system requests secondary content from the secondary content source.

Hence, since one ordinarily skilled in the art would recognize that “ssc.com” and “ics.com” are differing **root level domains**, it is clear that the question mark (“?”) in the redirection code allows for a client computer system (i.e. a requesting device) to detect a secondary content condition that **comprises a detection of a change in root level domains**.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the Examiner’s rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 has been overcome. A withdrawal of the rejection of is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-11, 19-29, 37, AND 38 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-11, 19-29, 37, and 38 stand rejected under **35 U.S.C. §103(a)** as being obvious over Blumenau, U.S. Patent No. 6,505,240 (hereinafter Blumenau) in view of Merriman, U.S. Patent No. 5,948,061 (hereinafter Merriman). Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that claims 1-11, 19-29, 37, and 38, are in condition for allowance.

Specifically, Blumenau is silent as to **intercepting, from a requesting device, an initial request for initial content prior to the initial request arriving at an intended destination**, as recited in amended independent claims 1, 19, 37 and 38. It is understood that **intercepting** clearly means to interrupt the course, progress, or

transmission to an **intended destination**. As discussed in Applicant's Specification, at page 4, such interception can occur at an entry point to the Internet itself.

Instead of a request for content being intercepted prior to arriving at its intended destination, Blumenau's intended site (e.g. content site, network site) properly receives the request and then transmits handoff instructions to proxy content sites. (See Col. 4, Lines 9-14) Even though Blumenau teaches that identifying a set of content and a proxy content site can be performed at any network site other than a primary content site, it does not discuss that such network sites are not the intended destinations of a content request. (See Col. 11, Lines 65-67, Col. 12, Lines 1-2) Rather, such network sites in Blumenau are intended destinations since parameters used in making the content and proxy site identifications are transmitted to the network sites at which such identifications are made. (See Col. 12, Lines 32-37) Hence, Blumenau does not disclose Applicants' **intercepted** limitation whereby content requests are processed **prior to arriving at an intended destination**.

Thus, in view of the above, neither of the cited references, individually or in combination, teach Applicants' invention and Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-11, 19-29, 37, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), thereby placing the pending claims in condition for allowance. A withdrawal of the rejection of is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 39-42 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 39-42 stand rejected under **35 U.S.C. §103(a)** as being obvious over Blumenau in view of Merriman and further in view of Subramaniam et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,081,900. Since the rejection of independent claims 1, 19, 37 and 38 has been overcome, the rejection of dependant claims 39-42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been traversed as well. A withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

-15-

If the either of the rejections are to be maintained, Applicants respectfully request that it be pointed out with particularity where the cited references disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations as disputed above.

Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

/DWR/

David W. Rouille, Esq.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 40,150
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: CIS01-05(3847)

Dated: July 9, 2007